UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/482,932	01/13/2000	Marcus Peinado	MSFT-0108/1273334.8	7699

41505 7590 05/31/2005

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP
ONE LIBERTY PLACE - 46TH FLOOR
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER	
CANGIALOSI, SALVATORE A	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
3621	

DATE MAILED: 05/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/482,932	PEINADO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Salvatore Cangialosi	3621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 May 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *106-115,117-119,122-138,140-142,145-158,162 and 163* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *106-115,117-119,122-138,140-142,145-158,162 and 163* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
>
> Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

2. Claims 106-115, 117-119, 122-138, 140-142, 145-158, 162 and 163 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over either Downs et al(6226618) or Clark(6343280) in view of Baratti et al(6574612).

Regarding claim 106, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11—16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose a means for digital right management having licensing evaluation from content rendering and where the result of license evaluation delivers or refuses to deliver an decryption key for the decryption of digital content substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the

use of the term license evaluator. It is noted that the license server of the prior art is functionally equivalent to the claim limitations. Baratti et al (See Fig. 1-3 and Col. 2, lines 35-60) show license servers distributing license authorization keys. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Downs et al or Clark because separate license servers and content delivery are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations. Regarding the trusted limitations of claim 107, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11—16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital right management having licensing evaluation from content rendering with secure and thus trusted components that are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations. Regarding access limitations of claim 108, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11—16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital right management having licensing evaluation from content rendering that exists in a protected environment apart from the user that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding license limitations of claim 109, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-

65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11–16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital right management having licensing evaluation from content rendering that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding license limitations of claim 110, Downs et al (See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11–16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital right management having licensing evaluation from content rendering that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding exchange limitations of claim 111, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11–16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital right management having licensing evaluation from content rendering that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding public key limitations of claim 112, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11–16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital rights management having licensing evaluation from content rendering and where the result of license evaluation delivers or refuses to deliver an decryption key for the decryption of

digital content employing public key encryption that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding public key limitations of claim 113, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11–16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital rights management having licensing evaluation from content rendering and where the result of license evaluation delivers or refuses to deliver an decryption key for the decryption of digital content employing public key encryption that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the license limitations of claim 114, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11–16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital rights management having licensing evaluation from content rendering that are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations. Regarding access limitations of claim 115, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11–16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital rights management having licensing evaluation from content rendering that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the

trusted limitations of claim 117, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11—16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital right management having licensing evaluation from content rendering with secure and thus trusted components that are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations. Regarding access limitations of claim 118, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11—16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital right management having licensing evaluation from content rendering that exists in a protected environment apart from the user that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding encryption limitations of claim 119, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11—16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital rights management having licensing evaluation from content rendering and where the result of license evaluation delivers or refuses to deliver an decryption key for the decryption of digital content that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding public key limitations of claim 122, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7,

lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11—16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital rights management having licensing evaluation from content rendering and where the result of license evaluation delivers or refuses to deliver an decryption key for the decryption of digital content employing public key encryption that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding license store limitations of claim 123, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11—16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital right management having licensing evaluation from content rendering that must exist in part on the computing device that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding license store limitations of claim 124, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11—16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital right management having licensing evaluation from content rendering that must exist in part on the computing device that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding memory limitations of claim 125, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines

1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11–16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital right management having licensing evaluation from content rendering that include standard memories that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations.. Regarding trusted limitations of claim 126, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11–16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital right management having licensing evaluation from content rendering that include trusted components that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding access limitations of claim 127, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11–16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital right management having licensing evaluation from content rendering that always deny user access to license data for billing purposes that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding license limitations of claim 128, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11–16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital right management having licensing evaluation from content

rendering that include prior license data that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding claim 129, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11—16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose a means for digital right management having licensing evaluation from content rendering and where the result of license evaluation delivers or refuses to deliver an decryption key for the decryption of digital content substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of the term license evaluator. It is noted that the license server of the prior art is functionally equivalent to the claim limitations. Baratti et al (See Fig. 1-3 and Col. 2, lines 35-60) show license servers distributing license authorization keys. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Downs et al or Clark because separate license servers and content delivery are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations. Regarding the trusted limitations of claim 130, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11—16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital right management having licensing evaluation from content rendering with secure and thus trusted components

that are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations. Regarding access limitations of claim 131, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11—16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital right management having licensing evaluation from content rendering that exists in a protected environment apart from the user that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding license limitations of claim 132, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11—16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital right management having licensing evaluation from content rendering that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding license limitations of claim 133, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11—16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital right management having licensing evaluation from content rendering that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding exchange limitations of claim 134, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11—

16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital right management having licensing evaluation from content rendering that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding public key limitations of claim 135, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11—16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital rights management having licensing evaluation from content rendering and where the result of license evaluation delivers or refuses to deliver an decryption key for the decryption of digital content employing public key encryption that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding public key limitations of claim 136, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11—16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital rights management having licensing evaluation from content rendering and where the result of license evaluation delivers or refuses to deliver an decryption key for the decryption of digital content employing public key encryption that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the license limitations of claim 137, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or

Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11—16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital rights management having licensing evaluation from content rendering that are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations. Regarding access limitations of claim 138, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11—16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital rights management having licensing evaluation from content rendering that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the trusted limitations of claim 140, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11—16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital right management having licensing evaluation from content rendering with secure and thus trusted components that are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations. Regarding access limitations of claim 141, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11—16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital right management having licensing evaluation from content rendering that exists in a protected environment apart from the user that is conventional

functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding encryption limitations of claim 142, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11—16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital rights management having licensing evaluation from content rendering and where the result of license evaluation delivers or refuses to deliver an decryption key for the decryption of digital content that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding public key limitations of claim 145, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11—16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital rights management having licensing evaluation from content rendering and where the result of license evaluation delivers or refuses to deliver an decryption key for the decryption of digital content employing public key encryption that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding license store limitations of claim 146, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11—16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital right management having licensing evaluation from content rendering that must exist in

part on the computing device that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding memory limitations of claim 147, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11—16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital right management having licensing evaluation from content rendering that include standard memories that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding memory limitations of claim 148, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11—16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital right management having licensing evaluation from content rendering that include standard memories that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding trusted limitations of claim 149, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11—16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital right management having licensing evaluation from content rendering that include trusted components that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding access limitations of claim 150, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual

separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11—16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital right management having licensing evaluation from content rendering that always deny user access to license data for billing purposes that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding license limitations of claim 151, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11—16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital right management having licensing evaluation from content rendering that include prior license data that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding claim 152, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11—16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose a means including executable code for digital right management having licensing evaluation from content rendering and where the result of license evaluation delivers or refuses to deliver an decryption key for the decryption of digital content substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of the term license evaluator. It is noted that the license server of the prior art is functionally equivalent to the claim limitations. Baratti et al (See Fig. 1-3 and Col. 2, lines 35-60) show license servers

distributing license authorization keys. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Downs et al or Clark because separate license servers and content delivery are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations. Regarding license limitations of claim 153, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11—16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital right management having licensing evaluation from content rendering that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding license limitations of claim 154, Downs et al (See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11—16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital right management having licensing evaluation from content rendering that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding exchange limitations of claim 155, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11—16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital right management having licensing evaluation from content rendering that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding public

key limitations of claim 156, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11—16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital rights management having licensing evaluation from content rendering and where the result of license evaluation delivers or refuses to deliver an decryption key for the decryption of digital content employing public key encryption that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding public key limitations of claim 157, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11—16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital rights management having licensing evaluation from content rendering and where the result of license evaluation delivers or refuses to deliver an decryption key for the decryption of digital content employing public key encryption that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding access limitations of claim 158, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11—16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital rights management having licensing evaluation from content rendering that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations.

Regarding public key limitations of claim 162, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11–16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital rights management having licensing evaluation from content rendering and where the result of license evaluation delivers or refuses to deliver an decryption key for the decryption of digital content employing public key encryption that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding license limitations of claim 163, Downs et al(See Figs. 1d-3, Col. 7, lines 20-25, Col. 12, lines 35-65, Col. 13, lines 1-65)(virtual separation) or Clark (See Figs. 1-3, 11–16,and 18, Col. 5, lines 1-35, and claims 1,8)(physical separation) both disclose digital right management having licensing evaluation from content rendering that include prior license data that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Salvatore Cangialosi at telephone number **(571) 272-6927**. The examiner can normally be reached 6:30 Am to 5:00 PM, Tuesday through Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell, can be reached at **(571)272-6712**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to (703)872-9306

Hand delivered responses should be brought to

United States Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 3600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is **(703) 306-5771**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SALVATORE CANGIALOSI
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 222